

Application No. 10/815,941
Amendment dated November 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

Docket No.: 42989-199768

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 and 7-17 are pending in the application, with claims 1, 5, 8, 12 and 14 being the independent claims. Claim 14 is amended. The amendment is not made in response to a rejection, but rather to now even more clearly set forth the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of each independent and dependent claim pending in the application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

On pages 2-3 of the present action, claims 8-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,476,984 (Ringdahl). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Ringdahl appears to disclose a "... razor *magnifying glass* having a magnifying lens adjustable attached to a handle clamp. The handle clamp is sized to attach to a razor." (Ringdahl, see Abstract, emphasis added). Ringdahl does not teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 8 and claim 12 comprising, in part, a *mirror* coupled to the hair trimming device, or the device of claim 14 comprising, in part, a mirror. The action aligns the magnifying lens (34) of Ringdahl with the mirror recited in the claims. This alignment is incorrect. The magnifying lens of Ringdahl is not a mirror, nor is the magnifying lens the equivalent of a mirror. A lens is an object designed to let light pass through it, while a mirror is designed to reflect light. Therefore, Ringdahl does not teach or suggest the apparatus of claim 8 and claim 12 comprising, in part, of a mirror coupled to the hair trimming device or the device of claim 14 comprising, in part, a mirror. Claims 8, 12, and 14 are allowable over Ringdahl.

Application No. 10/815,941
Amendment dated November 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

Docket No.: 42989-199768

Claims 9-11, 13, and 16-17 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claims 8, 12, and 14 respectively, which are allowable over Ringdahl for at least the reasons discussed above.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On pages 3-4, claims 1-5, 7 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,476,984 (Ringdahl). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

The Action has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. The Action states, on page 4, that Ringdahl fails to show the steps of facing a first mirror as a reflection of the mirror attached to the hair trimming device. Applicant agrees. In addition to failing to teach this step, Ringdahl also fails to teach or suggest a mirror, as described above with reference to claims 8, 12 and 14. The Action fails to address this element of claims 1 and 5. Therefore the Action has failed to set forth a prima facie case of obviousness. Claims 1 and 5 are non-obvious and allowable over Ringdahl.

Claims 2-4, 7 and 15 are allowable for at least depending from the independent claims 1 and 5 respectively, which are allowable over Ringdahl as discussed above.

Application No. 10/815,941
Amendment dated November 30, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 30, 2006

Docket No.: 42989-199768

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: November 30, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph P. Albrecht

Registration No.: 43466

VENABLE LLP

P.O. Box 34385

Washington, DC 20043-9998

(202) 344-4000

(202) 344-8300 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicant

DC2/807195